



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

mh

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,547	12/04/2003	Ilan Atias	PDS-014	5474
39933	7590	04/24/2007	EXAMINER	
POWERDSINE LTD. C/O LANDONIP, INC 1700 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 450 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314-2866			TRUJILLO, JAMES K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2116	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/24/2007	PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/726,547	ATIAS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	James K. Trujillo	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                   2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 40-44 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19, 31-36 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 19, 20, 37 and 39 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. It is hereby acknowledged that the following papers have been received and placed of record in the file: Amendment dated 2/12/07.
2. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1-7, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzenberg et al., U.S. Patent 6,218,930 in view of Le Creff et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0072438 (cited in IDS dated 10 March 2004).

5. Regarding claim 1, Katzenberg teaches a method for a powered device on an Ethernet based network for an excess demand condition, the method comprising:

- a. detecting an attached powered device (automatic detection of remote equipment being connected to the network, col. 1, lines 51-59);
- b. identifying an excess demand condition (overload or fault condition, col. 3, lines 49-58); and
- c. supplying power to said attached powered device for a first time interval thereby, said supplied power being sufficient to fully power the attached powered device (remote

equipment is operating then returns to an initial state upon an overload condition, col. 3, lines 49-58).

Katzenburg does not explicitly disclose notifying an end user of that the powered device will not be powered due to an excess demand condition or explicitly disclose notifying an end user that the powered device is not being powered because of an excess demand condition.

Le Creff also teaches

- detecting an attached powered device (detecting the presence of a telecommunications terminal, paragraph [0004]);
- identifying an excess demand condition (power cannot be supplied to a terminal, paragraph [0007]);
- notifying an end user of a powered device on an Ethernet based network that the powered device will not be powered due to an excess demand condition (recognizing the situation when no power can be supplied to a terminal, paragraph [0007]);
- notifying an end user that the powered device is not being powered because of an excess demand condition (paragraphs [0011] – [0012]).

Le Creff provides the advantage of allowing a user to be aware about origin of a power supply problem (paragraph [0006]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Katzenburg and Le Creff before them at the time the invention was made to modify the system

of Katzenburg to include notifying an end user that the powered device is not being power because of an excess demand condition.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to advantage of allowing a user to be aware about origin of a power supply problem in view of Le Creff.

6. Regarding claim 2, Katzenburg together with Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Katzenburg further teaches wherein said powered device is an IEEE 802.3 compliant device, (col. 1, lines 45-48). Le Creff also teaches wherein said powered device is a IEEE 802.3 compliant device (paragraph [0003]).

7. Regarding claim 3, Katzenburg together with Le Creff teaches the method according to claim 1, as described above. Katzenburg teaches wherein said detecting is accomplished over a connection selected from among 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT (using 100BaseX wiring requires using 100BaseT, col. 2, lines 36-51). Even if Katzenburg does not teach wherein said detecting is accomplished over a connection selected from among 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT the examiner takes official notice that 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT are well-known and commonly physical wiring that are used to connect devices in an Ethernet environment and is one of several media specified in IEEE 802.3 that are widely available and reliable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art having the teachings of KatzenburgLe Creff and the knowledge of the commonly used 10BaseT, 100BaseT and 1000BaseT connections to modify Katzenburg to use 10BaseT, 100BaseT or 1000BaseT connections. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because they are widely available and reliable types of physical wiring.

Art Unit: 2116

8. Regarding claim 4, Katzenburg together with Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Katzenburg also teaches wherein said supplying power is accomplished by one of an Ethernet switch and a Midspan device (Ethernet switches, figure 3). Le Creff also teaches wherein said supplying power is accomplished by one of an Ethernet switch and a Midspan device (switch, concentrator or a repeater, paragraph [0018]).

9. Regarding claim 5, Katzenburg together with Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising identifying the class of said attached powered device, said class comprising the power requirements of said attached powered device (class of said terminal, paragraph [0011]).

10. Regarding claim 6, Katzenburg together with Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising signaling said attached powered device of said excess demand condition (unable to supply required power and activate an alarm, paragraph [0011]).

11. Regarding claim 7, Katzenburg together with Le Creff taught the method according to claim 6, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising displaying on said attached powered device a message indicative of said excess demand condition (paragraph [0028]).

12. Regarding claims 14 and 15, Katzenburg together with Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Katzenburg and Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein said first time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the time interval between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Applicant has not

discloses that first time interval being between 10 seconds and 2 minutes provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any short time period because the combination of Katzenburg together with Le Creff teaches that the user only needs to be informed for a short time period. Similarly claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as claim 14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Katzenburg together with Le Creff to obtain the invention as recited in claims 14 and 15. Further, the multiple time intervals for the first time interval in claims 14 and 15 is construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in the type of actual time interval utilized and hence obvious variations of one another.

13. Claims 8-13, 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzenburg and Le Creff in view of Lehr et al, U.S. Patent 6,473,608.

14. Regarding claim 8, Katzenburg together with Le Creff taught the method according to claim 1, as described above. Katzenburg together with Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein further comprising storing an identifier of said detected attached powered device in a queue.

Lehr teaches storing an identifier of a detected attached powered device in a queue, said queue comprising an identifier of each of a plurality of attached power devices, said plurality comprising said stored identifier of said detected attached power devices (wherein a node is interpreted to be a device, col. 38, lines 52-60 and figure 19C; wherein in Lehr when a node is added to the queue an identifier is inherently required). Lehr is in the same field of endeavor as

that of Katzenburg and Le Creff in that both are directed toward supplying power to devices.

Lehr further teaches to one of ordinary skill in the art that using a queue provides an advantage of easily keeping track of the power consumed by the devices.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Katzenburg, Le Creff and Lehr before them at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Katzenburg together with Le Creff to include the queue as taught by Lehr.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide an easy means to track the power consumed by the devices in view of Lehr. As implemented with Katzenburg and Le Creff, it would result in a queue having a plurality comprising said stored identifier of said detected attached power devices.

15. Regarding claim 9, Katzenburg together with Le Creff taught the method according to claim 5, as described above. Further, claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 8 in view of Lehr.

16. Regarding claim 10, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Lehr taught the method according to claim 8, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising alternately supplying power to each of said plurality of attached powered devices identified by said identifier in said queue (queue as taught by Lehr) for a second time interval said alternately supplied power being sufficient to fully power said attached powered device identified by said identifier

(when no power can be supplied to the device it will turn it off after the message has been displayed, paragraph [0012]).

Art Unit: 2116

17. Regarding claim 11, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Lehr taught the method according to claim 10, as described above. Le Creff further teaches signaling each of said plurality of attached power device identified in said queue (queue as taught by Lehr) of said excess power demand condition (message on display of terminal, paragraph [0028]).

18. Regarding claim 12, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Lehr taught the method according to claim 11, as described above. Le Creff further teaches further comprising displaying on each of said plurality attached powered device a message indicative of said excess demand condition (message on display of terminal, paragraph [0028]).

19. Regarding claim 13, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Lehr taught the method according to claim 11, as described above. Le Creff further teaches wherein said second time interval is substantially the same as said first time interval (when no power can be supplied to the device it will turn it off after the message has been displayed is substantially within the same first time interval, paragraph [0012]).

20. Regarding claim 16, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Lehr taught the method according to claim 10, as described above. Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Lehr does not explicitly disclose wherein said second time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein said second time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the time interval between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Applicant has not disclosed that second time interval being between 10 seconds and 2 minutes provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in

the art, furthermore would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any short time period because Le Creff teaches that the user only needs to be informed for a short time period. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Le Creff to obtain the invention as recited in claim 16.

21. Regarding claim 17, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Lehr taught the method according to claim 8, as described above. Lehr further teaches wherein said first time interval is a function of the number of said identifiers in said queue (whether the new node requires power and if there is sufficient power available is dependent on other devices, col. 38, line 52 through col. 39, line 2).

Regarding claim 18, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Lehr taught the method according to claim 9, as described above. Lehr further teaches wherein said first time interval is a function of sum of the power requirements represented by said class of said identifiers in said queue (class of said terminal, paragraph [0011]).

22. Claims 21-27, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzenburg in view of Le Creff and Watamoto et al., U.S patent 6,392,695.

23. Regarding claim 21, Katzenburg taught an apparatus for a power device on an Ethernet based network the apparatus comprising:

- a. a powered device detector, for detecting an attached powered device connected thereto over communication cabling (automatic detection of remote equipment being connected to the network, col. 1, lines 51-59);

- b. an excess demand identifier, for identifying an excess demand condition (overload or fault condition, col. 3, lines 49-58); and
- c. a power enabler associated with said excess demand identifier said power enabler operative to supply power to said detected attached powered device for a first time interval;
- d. said supplied power being sufficient to fully power said detected attached powered device.

Katzenburg does not explicitly disclose a timer for timing a first time interval and notifying an end user that powered device will not be powered because of said identified excess demand condition.

Le Creff also teaches

- detecting an attached powered device (detecting the presence of a telecommunications terminal, paragraph [0004]);
- identifying an excess demand condition (power cannot be supplied to a terminal, paragraph [0007]);
- notifying an end user of a powered device on an Ethernet based network that the powered device will not be powered due to an excess demand condition (recognizing the situation when no power can be supplied to a terminal, paragraph [0007]);
- notifying an end user that the powered device is not being powered because of an excess demand condition (paragraphs [0011] – [0012]).

Le Creff provides the advantage of allowing a user to be aware about origin of a power supply problem (paragraph [0006]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Katzenburg and Le Creff before them at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Katzenburg to include notifying an end user that the powered device is not being powered because of an excess demand condition.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to advantage of allowing a user to be aware about origin of a power supply problem in view of Le Creff.

Watamoto teaches a timer for timing a first interval (a predetermined time to display a warning inherently requires a timer, col. 3, lines 7-13). Watamoto further teaches the advantage in that the predetermined time provides a time period to which the user may notice the warning message.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Katzenburg, Le Creff and Watamoto before them at the time the invention was made to modify the time interval of Katzenburg to include timer as taught by Watamoto.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to give the user a time period to notice a warning in view of Watamoto.

24. Regarding claim 22, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 21, described above. Le Creff further teaches wherein said powered device is a IEEE 802.3 compliant device (paragraph [0003]).

25. Regarding claim 23, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above. Further claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth hereinabove in the rejection of claim 3.

26. Regarding claim 24, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above. Katzenburg also teaches wherein said supplying power is accomplished by one of an Ethernet switch and a Midspan device (Ethernet switches, figure 3). Le Creff also teaches further teaches wherein said supplying power is accomplished by one of an Ethernet switch and a Midspan device (switch, concentrator or a repeater, paragraph [0018]).

27. Regarding claim 25, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising identifying the class of said attached powered device, said class comprising the power requirements of said attached powered device (class of said terminal, paragraph [0011]).

28. Regarding claim 26, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising signaling said attached powered device of said excess demand condition (unable to supply required power and activate an alarm, paragraph [0011]).

29. Regarding claim 27, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 1, as described above.

30. Regarding claims 34 and 35, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto taught the method according to claim 21, as described above. Katzenburg together with Le Creff and

Watamoto does not explicitly disclose wherein said first time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

However, at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the time interval between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Applicant has not discloses that first time interval being between 10 seconds and 2 minutes provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any short time period because Le Creff teaches that the user only needs to be informed for a short time period. Similarly, claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 34. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Le Creff to obtain the invention as recited in claims 34 and 35. Further, the multiple time intervals for the first time interval in claims 34 and 35 is construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in the type of actual time interval utilized and hence obvious variations of one another.

31. Claims 28-33, 36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katzenburg, Le Creff and Watamoto in further view of Lehr.

32. Regarding claim 28, Katzenburg together with Le Creff together with Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 21, as described above. Le Creff together with Watamoto does not explicitly disclose further comprising a storer associated with said power enabler; and queue associated with said storer, said storer storing an identifier of said detected attached powered device in said queue.

Lehr teaches a storer associated with a power enabler and a queue associated with said storer, said storer storing an identifier of a detected attached powered device in said queue, said queue comprising and identifier of each of a plurality of attached powered devices, said plurality comprising said stored identifier of said detected attached powered devices (wherein a node is interpreted to be a device, col. 38, lines 52-60 and figure 19C; wherein in Lehr when a node is added to the queue an identifier is inherently required and a queue inherently requires a storer such a memory device). Lehr further teaches to one of ordinary skill in the art that using a queue provides an advantage of easily keeping track of the power consumed by the devices.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Le Creff and Lehr before them at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Le Creff to include the queue as taught by Lehr.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification in order to provide an easy means to track the power consumed by the devices in view of Lehr.

33. Regarding claim 29, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto taught the apparatus according to claim 25, as described above. Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto does not explicitly disclose further comprising a storer associated with said power enabler; and queue associated with said storer, said storer storing an identifier of said detected attached powered device associated with said class of said attached powered device in said queue, said queue comprising an identifier of each of a plurality of attached powered device associated with a class, said plurality comprising said stored identifier of said detected attached powered device. However, claim 29 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth above in claim 28

in further view of Lehr. Further, Le Creff teaches using an associated class and thus teaches using an identifier for a class.

34. Regarding claim 30, Katzenburg together with Le Creff and Watamoto and Lehr taught the apparatus according to claim 28, described above. Katzenburg as combined with Le Creff, Watamoto and Lehr teaches further comprising an alternator associated with said power enabler said timer and said queue (the queue according to Lehr), wherein said timer times a second time interval, and said alternator alternatingly powers each of said attached powered device identified by said identifiers of said plurality of attached powered devices in said queue for said second time interval (the alternating of Katzenburg is interpreted to take place when the device initial powers up then is powered down on a fault condition, col. 3, lines 49-58). Le Creff also teaches further comprising an alternator associated with said power enabler said timer and said queue, wherein said timer times a second time interval, and said alternator alternatingly powers each of said attached powered device identified by said identifiers of said plurality of attached powered devices in said queue for said second time interval (when no power can be supplied to the device it will turn it off after the message has been displayed, paragraph [0012]).

35. Regarding claim 31, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the apparatus according to claim 30, described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising signaling means associated with said power enabler for signaling said attached powered device of said identified excess demand condition (message on display of terminal, paragraph [0028]).

36. Regarding claim 32, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the apparatus according to claim 30, described above. Le Creff teaches further comprising a display associated

with said powered device for displaying a message indicative of said excess demand condition (message on display of terminal, paragraph [0028]).

37. Regarding claim 33, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the apparatus according to claim 30, described above. Le Creff teaches wherein said second time interval is substantially the same as said first time interval (when no power can be supplied to the device it will turn it off after the message has been displayed is substantially within the same first time interval, paragraph [0012]).

38. Regarding claim 36, Le Creff together with Lehr taught the method according to claim 30, as described above. Le Creff together with Lehr does not explicitly disclose wherein said second time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Le Creff does not explicitly disclose wherein said second time interval is between 10 seconds and 2 minutes.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the time interval between 10 seconds and 2 minutes. Applicant has not discloses that second time interval being between 10 seconds and 2 minutes provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with any short time period because Le Creff teaches that the user only needs to be informed for a short time period. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art to modify Le Creff to obtain the invention as recited in claim 36.

39. Regarding claim 38, Le Creff together with Watamoto and Lehr taught the method according to claim 29, as described above. Lehr further teaches wherein said first time interval is

a function of the total power requirements represented by said class of said identifiers in said queue (class of said terminal and no power can be supplied to another device, paragraph [0011]).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

40. Claims 40-44 are allowed.
41. Claim 19, 20, 37 and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

42. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18, 21-36 and 38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

43. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2116

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James K. Trujillo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3677. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rehana Perveen can be reached on (571) 272-3676. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



James K. Trujillo  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2100